

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-9, and 11 are presented for consideration. Claims 1, 6, 7, and 11 are amended. No new claims are presented for consideration, no new matter is presented, and a new search is not required. Thus, at the very least, the Amendment should be entered to materially advance the prosecution of the application.

With regard to the Examiner's comment about the composition of the claims of record, the claims have been recast to clearly recite a system, in contrast to method claims. The claims are directed to a system which includes, inter alia, reactors...

Regarding the Examiner's objection to FIG. 2, attorney for applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not an improvement of a known machine or system, but is an entirely new improved reactor system including a first reactor system and a second reactor system. Consequently, since FIG. 2 depicts the system of the present invention, in its entirety. It would be improper to divide FIG. 2 into separate figures.

Since the claimed invention is a system, the connections between the protegy reactor and the remainder of the figure, which are illustrated clearly, also form part of the invention. Thus, attorney for applicant requests withdrawal of the objection raised by the Examiner.

Turning now to the objections raised under 35 USC §112, the Examiner contended that claim 1, as amended, "does not contain language introduced from claim 10 because claim 10 never recited a second reactor". Attorney for applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. The first and second "parts" of the energy production system included a primary reaction system and an enhanced reactor. It is respectfully submitted that this statement discloses two reactors. To resolve any doubt the Examiner may have, figure 2 of the specification, as filed, depicts two reactors namely a "protegy reactor" and an "enhanced reactor". Consequently, the use of two reactors was clearly included (albeit one referred to as a reactor, and the other a reaction system).

Claim 1, as amended, refers to "first and second reactors systems". Support for two reactor systems is provided, at least by considering original claim 10, which referred to a "primary reaction system" and an "enhanced reactor" in light of previous claim 1 which referred to an "enhanced reactor" as a "reaction system" and also mentioned "reaction systems in the reactor" (referring to th enhanced reactor).

Regarding the Examiner's objection to the inclusion of the term "Brownian motion" in claim 11, the reference to Brownian motion in claim 11 has been deleted.

Attorney for applicant now considers the rejection based on 35 USC §103. To support this rejection, the Examiner has cited two documents, namely U.S. Patent No. 6,866,835 (Stephenson) and U.S. Patent No. 3,442,620 (Schora et al). Claim 1, as amended, recites an energy production system comprising first and second reactor systems "wherein steam produced as a by-product of the first reactor system is introduced... into the second reactor system as the sole energy input" (emphasis added).

Stephenson is only concerned with a method for generating hydrogen and a single reaction system and, therefore, does not clearly disclose this feature. The Examiner contends that Schora teaches the production of hydrogen via the steam-iron process, and "that it would have been obvious... to combine the reactor in Stephenson with the reactor of Schora to make two reactors...". Although Schora is directed towards the production of hydrogen via a steam-iron process, there is no disclosure of two complete reaction systems (or reactors) being connected together for enhanced results, or any reason for doing so.

In contrast, the claimed invention, as recited in the amended claims, comprises two complete reaction systems, each reaction system including combining an electronegative half cell reaction with two electropositive half cell reactions to produce hydrogen and/or energy production from water. As the reactor in Schora does not have any of these features, we respectfully submit that even if a person skilled in the relevant technology had combined the reactor in Stephenson with Schora, he would not have arrived at the present invention.

Furthermore, as neither document recites, or even considers, the use of two reactor systems, there is also no disclosure, suggestion, or motivation to have steam produced as a by-product of a first reactor system, introduced at elevated temperature and a positive pressure, into a second reactor system, as the sole energy input to provide the necessary activation energy used by reaction systems in the second reactor system.


The Examiner has argued that the applicants do not provide a single example of the invention apparatus or process. Attorney for applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, as examples of the various features of a preferred embodiment of the claimed system are given in the summary of the invention, and also in the detailed description sections of the specification.

For example, the process of the reaction systems in a preferred embodiment is described in the detailed description where it states "In a preferred embodiment, the cell for carrying out the present invention s an alkaline cell, which uses an inert mesh cathode to provide electrons for the reduction of water according to the half cell equation...". Furthermore, suitable half cell reactions are provided, and the addition of stem in a second reaction system (referred to as an "enhanced reactor"), as well as details of the enhanced reactor, are also discussed. Attorney for applicant asserts that such disclosure is sufficient for a person skilled in the art to realize the claimed system.

In view of the (proposed) revisions to the claims of record, particularly independent claim 1, the instant Amendment should be entered, and considered favorably. The claims of record stress an apparatus, or system, of patentable merit.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 26, 2009

  
Martin P. Hoffman  
Reg. No. 22,261

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, P.C.  
2461 South Clark Street, Suite 522  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
703.415.0100  
Customer No. 20741

Attorney's Docket: A-9955.AMB/cat